1 2 -3 4	FEDERAI W	L ELECTION COMMISSION 999 E Street, N.W. ashington, D.C. 20463	SENSITIVE		
5	FIRST GEN	NERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT	CELA		
7 8 9 10 11		MUR: 7061 DATE COMPLAINT FILE DATES OF NOTIFICATION 08/12/2016 LAST RESPONSE RECEITED DATE ACTIVATED: 08/0	ON: 05/13/2016, VED: 08/01/2016		
13 14 15 16		ELECTION CYCLE: 2010 EXPIRATION OF SOL: 0	6		
17 18	COMPLAINANT:	Cherunda Fox			
19. 20 21 22 23	RESPONDENTS:	Hillary Victory Fund and Elizabeth Jones in her official capacity as treasurer Hillary for America and Jose Villarreal in his official capacity as treasurer			
24 25 26 27 28 29	RELEVANT STATUTES AND REGULATIONS:	52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1)(D 11 C.F.R. § 102.17(c)(5) 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(c)(5) 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(a), (b)	2016 NOY -4		
30 31	INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKEI	Disclosure Reports			
32	AGENCIES CHECKED:	None	1 1.9 €		
33	I. INTRODUCTION	•	•		
34	The Complaint alleges that a "Hillary Clinton fundraiser" held on April 15, 2016, raised				
35	contributions in excess of the applicable limits. For the reasons set forth below, we recommend				
36	that the Commission find no reason to believe that the Respondents violated the Commission's				
37 38	regulations or the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"), and close the file.				

See Compl. at 1 (May 9, 2016).

MUR 7061 (Hillary Victory Fund, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 2 of 4

1 II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

2	The Hillary Victory Fund ("HVF"), a joint fundraising committee, held the described			
3	fundraiser in San Francisco, California. ² HVF's participants included Hillary for America			
4	("HFA"), Hillary Clinton's principal campaign committee for the 2016 presidential election, the			
5	Democratic National Committee ("DNC"), and 32 state Democratic Party committees. ³			
6	According to HVF's website, it distributes its contributions using the following formula:			
7 8 9	 The first \$2,700/\$5,000 of each donation from an individual/PAC is allocated to HFA; 			
10 11 12	 The next \$33,400/\$15,000 of each donation from an individual/PAC is allocated to the DNC;⁴ 			
13 · 14 15	3) Additional amounts are divided equally among the participating Democratic state party committees, with a maximum contribution of \$10,000/\$5,000 per state party. ⁵			
16 17	The Complaint alleges that the fundraiser accepted \$353,000 from individuals in excess			
18	of the contribution limits at 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(a) because the state party participants were			
19	affiliated and subject to a single \$10,000 contribution limit. ⁶ Respondents maintain that the			

² See Hillary for America Resp. ("Resp.") at 1. As the Complaint makes its allegations against a "Hillary Clinton fundraiser," the Office of Complaints Examination and Legal Administration ("CELA") originally notified Hillary for America, Clinton's principal campaign committee. Hillary for America's Response indicated that the fundraiser was held by HVF, so CELA then notified HVF, which did not separately respond to the Complaint.

FEC Form 1, Statement of Organization, Hillary Victory Fund, (amended Nov. 2, 2015). This statement of organization was amended on July 1, 2016, to show that 38 state committees are now participating in HVF. See FEC Form 1, Statement of Organization, Hillary Victory Fund (amended July 1, 2016).

If a donation was made before the relevant primary election, then the second \$2,700/\$5,000 will be allocated to HFA's general election campaign fund, followed by the allocation set forth in parts 2 and 3. See https://www.hillaryclinton.com/donate/go/ (last visited Nov. 29, 2016).

See https://www.hillaryclinton.com/donate/go/ (last visited Nov. 29, 2016).

⁶ Compl. at 1.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

MUR 7061 (Hillary Victory Fund, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 3 of 4

participating state party committees are not affiliated and do not share a single \$10,000

2 contribution limit. We agree.

The Act imposes a \$10,000 limit on a person's contributions to a state party committee in any calendar year: "[n]o person shall make contributions . . . to a political committee established and maintained by a State committee of a political party in any calendar year which, in the aggregate, exceed \$10,000." This language indicates that the \$10,000 limit applies to contributions made to each state party committee; it does not apply the \$10,000 limit, in the aggregate, to all of the state party committees of a political party. Further, the regulations that apply to joint fundraising committees do not restrict an individual's ability to contribute up to the limit to multiple participating state party committees.

The Complainant relies on 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(a) and (b), which govern the contribution limits for affiliated committees and political party committees, respectively, but that position is not supported by those provisions. While subpart (a) applies to most committees and membership organizations, it explicitly excludes political party committees. Subpart (b) affiliates state party committees with their subordinate committees and clarifies that national and

⁷ See Resp. at 1.

⁸ 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1)(D) (emphasis added); see also 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(c)(5).

⁹ See 11 C.F.R. § 102.17(c)(5) ("Except to the extent that the contributor has previously contributed to any of the participants, a contributor may make a contribution to the joint fundraising effort which contribution represents the total amount that the contributor could contribute to all of the participants under the applicable limits of 11 CFR 110.1 and 110.2."). See also Advisory Op. 2004-12 (Democrats for the West) (advising that contributors could contribute up to \$10,000 to "one or more" of nine state party committees that were each affiliated with a common committee).

¹⁰ Compl. at 1.

¹¹ See 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(a)(2)(iv).

state committees are not affiliated.¹² Neither subpart (b) nor any other provision of the

Thus, the Complainant's allegations are not supported by the applicable law. We

Christopher L. Edwards

Attorney

Commission's regulations affiliates state party committees from different states.

MUR 7061 (Hillary Victory Fund, et al.)

First General Counsel's Report

Page 4 of 4

1

2

3

30

31 32

33

34

35 36 Factual and Legal Analysis

Attachment:

¹² See 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(b).

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

2	FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS			
3 4 5 6 7	RESPONDENTS:	Hillary Victory Fund Elizabeth Jones in her officia Hillary for America Jose Villerral in his official of	•	
8	I. INTRODUCTION			
9	The Comple	aint alleges that a "Hillary Clin	ton fundraiser" held on April 15, 2016, raised	
11.	contributions in excess of the applicable limits. The available information does not indicate that			
12	any of the Respondents violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the			
13	"Act"), because Hillary Victory Fund ("HVF") was able to solicit the fundraiser's maximum			
4	donation of \$353,400 per person.			
15	II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS			
16	HVF, a join	t fundraising committee, held th	e described fundraiser in San Francisco,	
17	California. ² HVF's	s participants included Hillary fo	or America ("HFA"), Hillary Clinton's	
18	principal campaign committee for the 2016 presidential election, the Democratic National			
9	Committee ("DNC"), and 32 state Democratic Party committees. ³ According to HVF's website			
20	it distributes its contributions using the following formula:			
21 22 23	•	first \$2,700/\$5,000 of each done located to HFA;	ation from an individual/PAC	

¹ See Compl. at 1 (May 9, 2016).

² See Hillary for America Resp. ("Resp.") at 1.

³ FEC Form 1, Statement of Organization, Hillary Victory Fund, (amended Nov. 2, 2015). This statement of organization was amended on July 1, 2016, to show that 38 state committees are now participating in HVF. See FEC Form 1, Statement of Organization, Hillary Victory Fund (amended July 1, 2016).

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Factual and Legal Analysis – MUR 7061 Hillary Victory Fund, et al. Page 2 of 3

- 1 2) The next \$33,400/\$15,000 of each donation from an individual/PAC is allocated to the DNC;⁴
 - 3) Additional amounts are divided equally among the participating Democratic state party committees, with a maximum contribution of \$10,000/\$5,000 per state party.⁵

The Complaint alleges that the fundraiser accepted \$353,000 from individuals in excess of the contribution limits at 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(a) because the state party participants were affiliated and subject to a single \$10,000 contribution limit.⁶ Respondents maintain that the participating state party committees are not affiliated and do not share a single \$10,000 contribution limit.⁷ The Commission agrees.

The Act imposes a \$10,000 limit on a person's contributions to a state party committee in any calendar year: "[n]o person shall make contributions . . . to a political committee established and maintained by a State committee of a political party in any calendar year which, in the aggregate, exceed \$10,000." This language indicates that the \$10,000 limit applies to contributions made to each state party committee; it does not apply the \$10,000 limit, in the aggregate, to all of the state party committees of a political party. Further, the regulations that apply to joint fundraising committees do not restrict an individual's ability to contribute up to the limit to multiple participating state party committees.

⁴ If a donation was made before the relevant primary election, then the second \$2,700/\$5,000 will be allocated to HFA's general election campaign fund, followed by the allocation set forth in parts 2 and 3. See https://www.hillaryclinton.com/donate/go/ (last visited Nov. 1, 2016).

See https://www.hillaryclinton.com/donate/go/ (last visited Nov. 1, 2016).

⁶ Compl. at I.

⁷ See Resp. at 1.

⁸ 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1)(D) (emphasis added); see also 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(c)(5).

See 11 C.F.R. § 102.17(c)(5) ("Except to the extent that the contributor has previously contributed to any of the participants, a contributor may make a contribution to the joint fundraising effort which contribution represents the total amount that the contributor could contribute to all of the participants under the applicable limits of 11 CFR 110.1 and 110.2."). See also Advisory Op. 2004-12 (Democrats for the West) (advising that contributors could

Factual and Legal Analysis – MUR 7061 Hillary Victory Fund, et al. Page 3 of 3

- The Complainant relies on 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(a) and (b), which govern the contribution
- 2 limits for affiliated committees and political party committees, respectively, but that position is
- 3 not supported by those provisions. 10 While subpart (a) applies to most committees and
- 4 membership organizations, it explicitly excludes political party committees. Subpart (b)
- 5 affiliates state party committees with their subordinate committees and clarifies that national and
- 6 state committees are not affiliated.¹² Neither subpart (b) nor any other provision of the
- 7 Commission's regulations affiliates state party committees from different states.
- 8 Thus, the Complainant's allegations are not supported by the applicable law. The
- 9 Commission therefore finds no reason to believe that the Respondents violated the Act or
- 10 Commission regulations as a result of the activities described in the Complaint.

contribute up to \$10,000 to "one or more" of nine state party committees that were each affiliated with a common committee).

¹⁰ Compl. at 1.

[&]quot; See 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(a)(2)(iv).

¹² See 11 C.F.R. § 110.3(b).